



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

dirai rien du fameux monologue de Figaro, nous savons tous comment les paroles du barbier devenu concierge sont vraies, et quelle immense influence elles eurent sur la France.

Malgré le mérite du "Mariage de Figaro," je préfère "le Barbier de Séville." Les personnages du "Barbier" sont plus naturels, et la gaieté y est plus franche. L'intrigue du "Mariage" est trop compliquée, elle me rappelle certaines pièces espagnoles où l'on voit des amoureux grimper à tous les balcons de la belle, entrer dans tous les cabinets, se trouvant mille fois face à face, rencontrant le père rébarbatif, le frère sanguinaire, et épousant l'un la cousine, l'autre la sœur qui se mourait d'un amour inconnu.

Avec BEAUMARCHAIS, je devrais peut-être finir cette esquisse de la comédie au XVIII^e siècle, mais je tiens à vous nommer COLLIN D'HARLEVILLE, et à vous engager à faire la connaissance de "M. de Crac" et du "Vieux Célibataire." Il faut aussi mentionner FABRE D'ÉGLANTINE qui eut l'audace de donner une suite au "Misanthrope." Son "Philinte de Molière" a toute l'énergie, toute la profondeur de "Turcaret." Mais avec FABRE la comédie du XVIII^e siècle est finie. Le bruit sourd de la guillotine qui tombe en emportant la tête de l'auteur comique, ainsi que celles de CAMILLE DESMOULINS et de DANTON, ce bruit, dis-je, a étouffé la voix des Valère, des Dorante, des Damis, des Figaro. Pendant longtemps on n'entendra plus que le grondement du canon, et la couronne de laurier que la France va cueillir n'ornera plus le front des REGNARD, des MARIVAUX, des LE SAGE, des BEAUMARCHAIS, elle deviendra une couronne impériale et ornera la tête d'un homme "grand comme le monde," mais fatal comme le destin.

ALCÉE FORTIER.

Tulane University of La.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SCRIBES OF 'BEOWULF.'

It is agreed that the scribes of 'Beowulf' have, in most particulars, changed the dialect of the poem from the Northumbrian to the West Saxon.

In tracing the genesis of the poem it is

necessary, as far as possible, to determine and eliminate the changes due to the scribes. Now, the manuscript as we have it is the work of two scribes, the first of whom closed his transcription with line 1939 (ZUPITZA's Autotypes, or line 1940 of HARRISON and SHARP's edition). The second scribe, beginning at this line, completed the copy and added, as is generally agreed, the three hundred and fifty lines of 'Judith.'

Certain differences in the work of these scribes arrested my attention while engaged in another research. A closer examination has convinced me that these points of difference are worthy of consideration, and justify the belief that the second scribe either wrote at a considerably later date, or came to the work with literary traditions different from those of the first scribe.

In presenting the evidence for this belief, I shall designate the first scribe as A, the second as B (the lines are numbered as in the edition of HARRISON and SHARP).

1. The use of *ð* and *p*.

A uses final *p* 35 times; *p* or *ð* final or medial, with apparent indifference. B uses *p* final once, medial 13 times. A uses final *p* in the present of verbs:—*dælep* 1757, *grēoteþ* 1343, *gæþ* 604, *styrep* 1375, *swefep* 1009, *swýðep* 279, *wéneþ* 601, *drysmæþ* 1376, *fundiaþ* 1820, *hwyrfaþ* 98, *losaþ* 1393, *-witaþ* 291, *wurðað* 282:—13 times out of a possible 91 times; 4 of the above also occur in A with final *ð* (*gæð* 455, *swefeð* 1742, *-swýðeð* 1769, *-witeð* 1361).

B uses final *p* in the present of verbs—*-healdeþ* 2294. This word also occurs with final *ð* 2910. *p* is used once in 52 possible cases in B. Of the verbs in the present of which A uses final *p*, B has the following with final *ð*:—*gæð* 2035, 2055, *losað* 2063, *swefeð* 2061, 2747, *swefað* 2257, 2458, *-witeð* 2461, *weorðeð* 2914, *weorðað* 2067.

A uses final *p* in other words 23 times, B not at all; *oð* in combination with *þæt*, however, sometimes forms *oppæt*.

In medial position—this division does not include the use of *ð* or *p* to introduce the second member of compound words—B uses *p* in *æpelan* 2235, *æpelung* 5 times, *ēpel* twice, *hroþra* 2172, *mæpelade* 2436, *mæpelode* 2725, *morþor-* 2437, *nīpe* 2681, *hwæpre* 2099.

Of these the following also occur in B with δ :—*æðeling* 5 times, *éðel* 4 times, *hroðre* 2443, *maðelode* 4 times, *morðor-* 2743 and twice as a simple word, *níð* 14 times in various forms, *hwæðer* 4 times. In other words B uses β exclusively in *æpelan* alone, and this word occurs but once.

A uses medial β about as often as medial δ . A uses medial β in every word where it is found in B except in *æpelan* and *hroþre*, which do not occur in A. β and δ in the above words are found in A in this proportion:— β in stem of *æpeling* 20 times, δ once; β in *épel* 3 times, δ in *éðel* once; β in *maþelode* 15 times, δ in *maðelode* 4 times; β in derivatives of *morp* 3 times, δ in *morð* 3 times; β in *nip* twice, δ in *níð* 12 times.

That this evident levelling of β and δ to δ in B is the work of the scribe and not due to original differences in the text is rendered reasonably certain by such instances as these:—*-níþas* 1859, *-níða* 1948; *Hæreþes* 1930, *Hæreðes* 1982; *wurþad* 1646, *weorðod* 1960,—unless, indeed, differences of authorship in the poem coincide with the change in scribe, a position maintained, I think, by no scholar. Indeed, the use of medial and final β in B is so infrequent and of such a nature that it impresses one as an oversight in the copying of a manuscript in which β was present, unless it be in the forms of *æpel* and *épel*, where it seems possible that a traditional spelling influenced the scribe.

An examination of Cook's edition of 'Judith,' which, I believe, preserves every β of the autotypes, fails to reveal a single final β and but one medial—*óþre* 109—in the 350 lines.

A's use of β and δ is so capricious as to lead one to doubt whether he was guided by even traditional spelling except in a few common words, as *wið*, which he uniformly spells with δ . Examples of β and δ final would be *síp*, but once 579, *síð* 20 times; *forð* 12 times, *forþ* not at all; *gúþ* 6 times, *gúð* 32 times.

The difference in custom between A and B is strikingly shown in certain words:—A uses *eorþan* 5 times, *eorðan* twice, *eorð-* once; B uses *eorðan* 6 times, *eorð-* 10 times: A *heapo-* 10 times, *heaðo-* 8 times; but B *heaðo-*, or *u-* 14 times: A *scapa* 4 times, *scaða* 8 times; but B *sceaða* 11 times: A *deap* 3 times, *deað* 9 times; but B *deað* 8 times.

But A's perplexity becomes distressing in cases of $\delta\delta$. He spells *syðþan* 10 times, *syþðan* 19 times, *seopðan* twice, *sipþan* once, *sipðan* twice, *seoððan* once, *siððan* 4 times, *syððan* twice; but B employs *syððan* uniformly, 18 times.

Initial β is generally retained by both scribes, though a tendency to substitute δ is traceable in B, and still more discernible, I think, in 'Judith.'

2. Dialectal Differences.

The words of the first column are those used by A; of the second column those by B:

<i>déore,</i>	<i>dýre,</i>
<i>self,</i>	<i>sylf,</i>
<i>sellan,</i>	<i>syllan,</i>
<i>scolde,</i>	<i>sceolde,</i>
<i>scoldon,</i>	<i>sceoldon,</i>
<i>-scaða,</i>	<i>-sceaða,</i>
<i>scacen,</i>	<i>sceacen,</i>
<i>cearwylm,</i>	<i>cearwælm,</i>
<i>ymb,</i>	<i>ymbe,</i>
<i>atol,</i>	<i>eatol,</i>
<i>ylde,</i>	<i>eldo</i>
<i>gamol</i> (<i>gomel</i> once),	<i>gomel,</i>
<i>nalles,</i>	<i>nealles</i> (except 2504),
<i>hæbbe,</i>	<i>hafo</i> and <i>hafu,</i>
<i>eofor,</i>	<i>eafor,</i>
<i>swiðe,</i>	<i>swýðe,</i>
{ <i>weorðad,</i>	<i>weorðod,</i>
{ <i>wurþad,</i>	
<i>ylde,</i>	<i>elde</i> (except 2118),
<i>nýd,</i>	<i>-néðla,</i>
<i>fand,</i>	<i>fond</i> (except 2790),
<i>maþelode,</i>	<i>maþelade,</i>
<i>syrce,</i>	<i>-serce, -sercean,</i>
<i>hycgende.</i>	<i>hycgende,</i>
<i>hafola,</i>	<i>heafola,</i>
<i>-cwíde,</i>	<i>-cwýde,</i>
<i>is</i>	<i>ys,</i>
<i>gesáwon,</i>	<i>geségan.</i>

One might expect that in correspondence with such differences in dialect, there would be a marked difference in the use of *a* and *o* before nasals. This, however, does not seem to be the case. H. MÖLLER in *Englische Studien* vol. xiii, p. 258 gives the correspondences as follows:—

v. 1—927	130 <i>a</i> : 65 <i>o</i> = 2:1
v. 928—1340	73 <i>a</i> : 9 <i>o</i> = 8:1
v. 1341—1944	70 <i>a</i> : 60 <i>o</i> = 7:6

or v. 1—1944 303 a: 134 o, *i.e.* less than
3: 1 in A, while in B—

v. 1945—2199 31 a: 32 o

v. 2200—3183 79 a: 139 o

or v. 1945—3183 110 a: 171 o

These figures do not seem to me to signify anything except an unsettled tradition concerning the use of *a* and *o* before nasals.

CHAS. DAVIDSON.

Belmont School, Cal.

BIRUT IN TATIAN,

In TATIAN CXXXVIII (= *Matt.* xxvi, 10) occurs the phrase: *Ziu birut ir hefige themo uube?* The meaning is plain from the Latin: "quid molesti estis mulieri." But I have searched in vain for a grammatico-lexical discussion of *birut*. In the first place, why *birut* rather than *bërut*? The *bir-* must be *i*-umlaut of *bër-*, but there is nothing in the termination to induce *i*-umlaut phonetically. BRAUNE, '*A. H. D. Gr.*,' §308, *An.* 1, mentions 2. pl. forms *quidit, gasihit, ferit*, in the Monsee-Vienna Fragments, for *quëdet, gasëhet, faret*. But he says nothing of such forms in TATIAN. Are we to regard the *i*-umlaut as a transference from the 2nd and 3rd sg. to the plural, as in Icelandic the 1st sg. is umlauted by analogy of the 2nd and 3rd sg. (*cf.* NOREEN, §§443, 446)? SIEVERS, in the Introduction to his edition of TATIAN makes no mention of this *birut* (it should be given somewhere in the neighborhood of page 31), nor does he cite it in his glossary, sub *bëran*. Although *hefige* is treated in the glossary as n. pl. of the adjective *hefig*.

In the next place, what is the exact lexical interpretation of *bëran* in the passage? The treatment of this verb in all the O.H.G. lexicons accessible to me is certainly *stiefmütterlich*. BRAUNE, in the Glossary to his 'Reader' contents himself with "*tragen, hervorbringen, gebären*." SIEVERS, in his TATIAN, defines "*gebären, hervorbringen*," citing passages that render the Latin *ferre, parere, gignere, etc.* GRAFF defines with "*ferre, parere, gignere, generare*." SCHADE: "*Zum Vorschein bringen, hervorbringen, tragen, gebären*; intransitive, *Zum Vorschein kommen, treiben, wachsen, geboren werden*."

No one seems to have thought it worth while to examine the verb in its Anglo-Scandian idioms. Now, SCHILLING and COSIJN, *MOD. LANG. NOTES*, Nov. 1886, Jan. 1887, have shown conclusively that the Anglo-Saxon *beran* occurs as an intransitive verb of motion = 'to go,' '*ferri*,' '*transire*.' To the passages cited by SCHILLING and COSIJN may be added *bëron ut hræde*, 'Andreas' 1221, which GREIN renders "[*sie*] *stürmten jählings hinaus*."

Beran in the sense of 'to go' will not explain the TATIAN-passage. But it will at least force lexicographers to enlarge their notions of the meaning of the verb. As for the Icelandic *bera*, its functions seem endless. VIGFÚSSON'S 'Dictionary' p. 58, column *b*, sub *B*, gives a variety of legal idioms, one of which approaches somewhat to the sense in TATIAN; viz., *bera e-m á brýn* (pl. of *brún*, 'eye-brow') = 'to throw in one's face, accuse.' But the nearest approach to TATIAN is that of the Modern English in such a phrase as: "Caius Ligarius doth beare Caesar hard," and "Bear with me," both in SHAKESPEARE'S "Julius Cæsar" (*cf.* MURRAY'S 'Dictionary' p. 732, nos. 16 and 17). The easiest explanation of the varied significance of the verb *beran* that suggests itself to me is this: primary meaning 'to carry,' '*portare*,' by figurative extension 'to carry in the womb'; secondarily, 'to carry oneself,' hence the endless Icelandic idioms cited by VIGFÚSSON p. 59 column *b*, sub *C*, all with the general sense of 'to happen,' *i.e.*, a thing brings itself about. And 'to carry oneself' in the sense of going through a physical or moral motion, or striking a physical or moral attitude, will explain not only TATIAN and SHAKESPEARE but also the Anglo-Saxon so-called intransitive 'to go,' and such modern English as 'the ship bore down upon us.'

J. M. HART.

University of Cincinnati.

AN ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE ETYMOLOGY OF *gospel*.

On a former occasion (*MOD. LANG. NOTES* iv, p. 104 f.) the ground was taken that the word *gospel* had become subject to the caprice of "popular etymology." A certain gloss of the